

REMARKS

Claims

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. Claims 4, 12, 20, 24, 26 and 27 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Time Period for Response to Office Action

The Office Action mailed September 8, 2006, set a time period of one month for reply to the Office Action, alleging that the present application has been granted special status under the accelerated examination program.

It is believed that this time period for reply was in error, and should instead have been three months, as this application has NOT been granted special status under the accelerated examination program.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 4, 12, 20, 24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants traverse these rejections and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the amendments to these claims and for the following reasons.

In claim 4, the term "circulation quantity" has been replaced with "flow quantity". This terminology finds support in the specification at, e.g., page 12, lines 11-17, and FIGS. 2 and 4. For example, the flow quantity through the bypass route is reduced by valve 54 to increase the flow quantity through the devices, and *vice versa*.

Claim 12 has been amended to clarify the language. The joint with automatic valve is discussed generally in the specification, e.g., at page 17, lines 13-22. The joints with automatic valve may be located on the rear of the server module, as illustrated, e.g., in FIG. 6, and as discussed, e.g., at page 18, lines 5-6. A connecting direction of the joints corresponds to a mounting direction of the server module so that when mounting the server module to the joints, the automatic valves in the joints are opened.

Claim 20 has been amended to read that the cooling air flows in a direction from a front side to a rear side of the cabinet.

Claims 24 and 26 have been amended to correct antecedence errors.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13, 19, 21-23, 25 and 27-29 have been allowed over the art of record. Claim 27 has been amended to correct a minor informality.

The subject matter of claims 4, 12, 20, 24 and 26 was indicated to be allowable if these claims were amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 discussed above. Accordingly, as it is believed that these rejections have been overcome, these claims should now be in condition for allowance. Should any minor informalities remain in the claims or the remainder of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney via telephone to resolve these matters.

Serial No. 10/776,231
Amendment filed October 10, 2006
Response to Office Action mailed September 8, 2006

Docket No. T&A-126

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,


Colin D. Barnitz
Registration No. 35,061

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: October 10, 2006